

Appendix A

PROJECT STUDY ISSUE CHECKLIST

Sensitive Policy Areas Which Require Vertical Team Coordination with MSC/HQUSACE to Washington: (Issues not previously accounted for in an Administration approved Feasibility/Chiefs Report)

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name: (State, County, River Basin/Waterbody under Study)

Project Description: (Need project description with general details, such as a fact sheet attached--if project is the same as authorization attach a summary, if different provide a description of what differs from original authorization, the authorizing language, and dimensions to give perspective of the change in scope and scale. If there was an authorizing report, what level approved it—i.e., OMB, ASA(CW), HQUSACE (include date of approval). If no prior reports, give a more detailed description.)

Cost Sharing: (Describe the cost sharing for the project to be constructed. Describe whether the cost sharing follows general law or if there is other special cost sharing for the project)

1. Has a NEPA document been completed?

Response: YES ____ NO ____*

Remarks:

2. Will the NEPA Documentation be more than 5 years old at the time of PCA signing or construction initiation?

Response: YES * ____ NO ____

Remarks:

3. Will the ESA Findings be more than 3 years old at the time of PCA signing or construction initiation? [Note: Findings refers to Corps documentation and/or US Fish and Wildlife Service's opinions and recommendations]

Response: YES * ____ NO ____

Remarks:

* Response where a "*" requires coordination through vertical team and complete description of issues under "Remarks", before decision to approve project/report can be delegated.

EC 1165-2-205
31 March 2004

4. Is ESA coordination complete?

Response: YES ___ NO ___*

Remarks:

5. If an EIS/EA was completed for the project, has the Record of Decision/Finding of No Significant Impact been signed?

Response: YES ___ NO ___*

Remarks:

6. Is the proposed project consistent with the ROD/FONSI?

Response: YES ___ NO ___*

Remarks:

7. Have there been any changes in Federal environmental laws or Administration or Corps policy since original project authorization that make updating necessary? [e.g., change to the Clean Air Act status for the project area...going from attainment to non-attainment]

Response: YES * ___ NO ___

Remarks:

8. Is there a mitigation plan?

Response: a. Fish and Wildlife: YES ___*___ NO ___
b. Flood Damage: YES ___*___ NO ___
c. Cultural and Historic Preservation: YES ___*___ NO ___
d. Recreation: YES ___*___ NO ___

Remarks: [If yes, identify and describe what is being mitigated and cost shared. Describe the authority for the cost sharing.]

9. Are the mitigation plan(s) that are now being proposed the same as the authorized plan?

Response: a. Fish and Wildlife YES ___ NO ___*
d. Flood Damage YES ___ NO ___*
e. Cultural and Historic Preservation YES ___ NO ___*
f. Recreation YES ___ NO ___*

Remarks:

* Response where a "*" requires coordination through vertical team and complete description of issues under "Remarks", before decision to approve project/report can be delegated.

31 March 2004

10. Is there an incremental analysis/cost effectiveness analysis of the fish and wildlife mitigation features based on an approved method and using an accepted model?

Response: YES _____ NO _____*

Remarks:

11. Is it expected that the project's fully funded cost would exceed the cost limit of Section 902 of WRDA 1986? [Note: for hurricane and storm damage reduction projects there are two separate 902 limits, one for initial project construction and one for periodic renourishment]

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks: [In this section provide the authorized project cost, price level, and current and fully funded project cost estimates and price levels]

12. Does the project involve HTRW clean-up?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

13. Does the work involve CERCLA covered materials?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

14. Are the project purposes now being proposed different than the authorized project? [Note: different than specifically noted in authorization or noted in Chief's report and is it measured by project outputs]

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

15. Are there any proposed scope changes to the authorized project? [Reference: ER 1105-2-100]

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks: [Describe the authority that would enable the project to proceed without additional Congressional modification]

* Response where a "*" requires coordination through vertical team and complete description of issues under "Remarks", before decision to approve project/report can be delegated.

16. Is Non-Federal work-in-kind included in the project? [Note: Credit to a non-Federal sponsor for work-in-kind must be based upon having an existing authority. Need to identify the authority and if not a general authority such as Sec 215, provide a copy of the authority.]

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

17. Does project have work-in-kind authority? [Note: If there is no existing authority, as determined in conjunction with District Counsel, the only other vehicle is to propose work-in-kind and rationale in the decision document and submit to HQUSACE for specific Congressional authorization.]

Response: YES _____ NO _____ *

Remarks:

18. Are there multiple credit authorities (e.g., Sec. 104 & 215) including LERRDs, Work-In-Kind and Ability to Pay? [Note: See App. B of ER 1165-2-131. Describe the authority for work-in-kind and if authority exists, the PM should submit a completed App. B through the vertical team.]

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

19. Is an Ability to Pay cost sharing reduction included in the proposed project? [If yes, fully describe the proposal, citing how this authority is applicable. Include a table showing the cost sharing by project purpose and expected Ability to Pay reductions.]

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

20. Is the recommended plan different from the NED plan? [Note: if this answer is yes, then a series of questions arise that will need to be addressed in the Remarks section...is plan less costly than NED plan, is the plan more costly with the same cost sharing as NED plan (exception), is plan more costly with all costs exceeding the cost of the NED plan at 100% non-Federal cost, or has ASA(CW) already granted an exception]

Response: YES* _____ NO _____

Remarks:

21. Was a standard accepted Corps methodology/model used to calculate NED benefits?

Response: YES _____ NO _____ *

Remarks:

*** Response where a "*" requires coordination through vertical team and complete description of issues under "Remarks", before decision to approve project/report can be delegated.**

22. Are there non-standard benefit categories? [Reference ER 1105-2-100].

Response: YES ☐ * NO ☐

Remarks:

NAVIGATION COMPONENT (INLAND OR HARBOR)

23. Is there a navigation component in the project?

Response: YES ☐ NO ☐

(If Yes, answer each of the following questions)

24. Is there land creation?

Response: YES ☐ * NO ☐

Remarks:

25. Is there a single owner and/or beneficiary which is not a public body? [Public body as defined by Section 221 of WRDA 1970]

Response: YES ☐ * NO ☐

Remarks:

26. Are there proposals for Federal cost sharing of Local Service Facilities [e.g., dredging of non-Federal berthing areas] work?

Response: YES ☐ * NO ☐

Remarks:

27. Is there sediment remediation proposed under Sec. 312 authority? [i.e., Section 312 of WRDA 1990 as amended by Section 205 of WRDA 1996]

Response: YES ☐ * NO ☐

Remarks:

28. Is there dredged material placement on beaches where the use is not the least costly environmentally acceptable plan?

Response: YES ☐ * NO ☐

Remarks:

*** Response where a “*” requires coordination through vertical team and complete description of issues under "Remarks", before decision to approve project/report can be delegated.**

EC 1165-2-205
31 March 2004

29. Will the dredged material be used for ecosystem restoration where the recommended plan is not the least costly environmentally acceptable plan?

Response: YES *____ NO ____

Remarks:

30. Does the project have recreation navigation benefits?

Response: YES *____ NO ____

Remarks:

31. Does the project involve inland navigation harbor development?

Response: YES *____ NO ____

Remarks:

32. Can the resale or lease of lands used for disposal of excavated material recover the cost of the improvements?

Response: YES *____ NO ____

Remarks:

33. Will acquisition of land outside the navigation servitude be necessary for construction of the improvements (either the project or non-Federal facilities that will use or benefit from the project) and will this permit local entities to control access to the project. [The latter case is assumed to exist where the proposed improvement consists of a new channel cut into lands.]

Response: YES *____ NO ____

Remarks:

FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION COMPONENT

34. Is there a flood damage reduction component in the project?

Response: YES ____ NO ____

(If Yes, answer each of the following questions)

35. Is the project for protection of a single property or beneficiary?

Response: YES *____ NO ____

Remarks:

*** Response where a "*" requires coordination through vertical team and complete description of issues under "Remarks", before decision to approve project/report can be delegated.**

36. Is the project producing land development opportunities/benefits? [If land creation benefits are expected to occur, describe whether special cost sharing should apply.]

Response: YES *_____ NO _____

Remarks:

37. Is there any recommendation to cost share any interior drainage facilities?

Response: YES *_____ NO _____

Remarks:

38. Are there any windfall benefits that would accrue to the project sponsor or other parties? [If windfall benefits are expected to occur, describe whether special cost sharing should apply.]

Response: YES *_____ NO _____

Remarks:

39. Are there non-structural buyout or relocation recommendations?

Response: YES *_____ NO _____

Remarks: [If yes list the authority and describe what is proposed]

40. Are the reallocation studies likely to change the existing allocated storage in lake projects ?

Response: YES *_____ NO _____

Remarks:

HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION COMPONENT

41. Is there a Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction component in the project?

Response: YES _____ NO _____

[If Yes, answer each of the following questions]

42. Does the project provide for protection of privately owned shores?

Response: YES *_____ NO _____

Remarks:

*** Response where a “*” requires coordination through vertical team and complete description of issues under "Remarks", before decision to approve project/report can be delegated.**

43. Does the project provide for protection of undeveloped lands?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

44. Does the project provide for protection of Federally owned shoreline at Federal cost?
[If yes, describe what is to be protected and who bears the federal cost.]

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

45. Does the project involve tidal or fluvial flooding, i.e. is it clear what the project purpose is and has the project been formulated as a hurricane and storm damage reduction project or flood damage reduction project?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

46. Is there any recommendation to cost share any interior drainage facilities?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

47. Is recreation > 50% of total project benefits needed to justify the project?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

48. Are there any parking or public access issues [no public access or none provided within 1/2 mile increments]?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

49. Are easements being provided to ensure public use and access?

Response: YES _____ NO * _____ NA _____

Remarks:

50. Is there a Sec. 934 of WRDA 1986 extension of the period of authorized Federal participation?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

*** Response where a "*" requires coordination through vertical team and complete description of issues under "Remarks", before decision to approve project/report can be delegated.**

51. Are there any Sec. 111 of Rivers and Harbors Act of 1958, as amended proposals?

Response: YES *____ NO____

Remarks:

ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION COMPONENT

52. Is there an ecosystem restoration component of the project?

Response: YES____ NO____

(If Yes, answer each of the following questions)

53. Has the project been formulated using cost effectiveness and incremental analysis techniques?

Response: YES____ NO__*

Remarks:

54. Was "IWR Plan" used to do cost effectiveness/incremental analysis?

Response: YES____ NO__*

Remarks:

55. Are all the benefits aquatic?

Response: YES____ NO__*

Remarks:

56. Is the project purpose for restoration of cultural or historic resources as opposed to ecosystem restoration?

Response: YES *____ NO

Remarks:

57. Is there mitigation authorized or recommended?

Response: YES *____ NO____

Remarks:

58. Are there recommendations for other than restoring a degraded ecosystem [e.g., creating new habitat where it has never been]?

Response: YES *____ NO____

Remarks:

*** Response where a "*" requires coordination through vertical team and complete description of issues under "Remarks", before decision to approve project/report can be delegated.**

59. Has the significance of the habitat been clearly identified? [Note: Under Remarks, describe the basis for determining the significance.]

Response: YES _____ NO ____*

Remarks:

60. Has the restoration project been formulated for biological/habitat values? As opposed to, for example, water quality.

Response: YES _____ NO ____*

Remarks:

61. Is the project on non-public lands?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

62. Does the project involve land acquisition where value > 25% of total project cost?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

63. Are all the proposed recreation features in accordance with ER 1105-2-100, Appendix E, Exhibit E-3?

Response: YES _____ NO ____*

Remarks:

64. Are there recommendations to include water quality improvement?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

65. Is the monitoring & adaptive management period proposal beyond 5 years after completion of construction?

Response: YES * _____ NO _____

Remarks:

* Response where a "*" requires coordination through vertical team and complete description of issues under "Remarks", before decision to approve project/report can be delegated.

66. Does the proposal involve land acquisition in other than fee title?

Response: YES * ☐ NO ☐

Remarks:

67. Are there recommendations for non-native species?

Response: YES * ☐ NO ☐

Remarks:

68. Does the project propose the use of navigation servitude?

Response: YES * ☐ NO ☐

Remarks:

RECREATION COMPONENT

69. Is there a recreation component as part of the project?

Response: YES ☐ NO ☐

(If Yes, answer each of the following questions)

70. Is the cost of proposed recreation development > 10 % of the Federal project cost without recreation, [except for nonstructural flood damage reduction and hurricane and storm damage projects]?

Response: YES * ☐ NO ☐

Remarks: [Describe the proposal and whether ASA(CW) approval has been granted.]

71. Are there recreation features located on other than project lands?

Response: YES * ☐ NO ☐

Remarks:

72. Does the project involve/provide for waterfront development?

Response: YES * ☐ NO ☐

Remarks:

* Response where a "*" requires coordination through vertical team and complete description of issues under "Remarks", before decision to approve project/report can be delegated.

EC 1165-2-205
31 March 2004

73. Does the project involve the need to reallocate authorized storage [Sec III, App E, ER 1105-2-100]?

Response: YES *____ NO ____

Remarks:

74. Does the project include non-standard recreation facilities? [refer to ER 1105-2-100, Appendix E, Exhibit E-2]

Response: YES *____ NO ____

Remarks:

WATER SUPPLY COMPONENT

75. Is there a water supply component as part of the project?

Response: YES ____ NO ____

(If Yes, answer each of the following questions)

76. Does the project use non-standard pricing for reallocated storage?

Response: YES *____ NO ____

Remarks:

77. Are there exceptions to model contract/agreement language?

Response: YES *____ NO ____

Remarks:

*** Response where a "*" requires coordination through vertical team and complete description of issues under "Remarks", before decision to approve project/report can be delegated.**

CONCURRENCE

Project Manager

Date: _____

Chief, Planning Division

Date: _____

District Counsel

Date: _____

DDE (PM)

Date: _____

Planning and Policy CoP (MSC)

Date: _____

MSC Counsel

Date: _____